



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/845,456	04/30/2001	Ankur Gupta	70006695-1	3022

7590

02/16/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

SIDDIQI, MOHAMMAD A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2154

DATE MAILED: 02/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/845,456

Applicant(s)

GUPTA, ANKUR

Examiner

Mohammad A Siddiqi

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 November 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-24 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

3. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ismael et al. (6,134,581) (hereinafter Ismael).

4. As per claim 1, Ismael discloses Network management system for a computer network comprising: a first computer system having a network management master-agent process unit installed therein (6, 3,fig 1);

A plurality of second computer systems, wherein a network management sub-agent (20, fig 1) process is installed on each of the second

computer systems (4, 5, fig 1) and wherein the second computer systems are different from the first computer system (4, 5, fig 1);

the network management master-agent unit (6,3,fig 1) having

a first interface being adapted to communicate (20, fig 3) with a network management software (20,fig 3) module using a network management protocol format (20,fig 3, col 2, lines 9-13 and col 5, lines 25-39);

a second interface being adapted to communicate (20,fig 3) with the network management (20,fig 3, col 2, lines, 14-26) sub-agent processes using an object-oriented interface description language format (col 3, lines 9-24) and being connected between the first computer system and the plurality of second computer systems (3, 4, 5, and 2, fig 1);

the network management master-agent process unit (3,6, fig 1) further comprising a converting (col 8, lines 26-33) unit for converting a message according (col 3, lines 9-19) to the network management protocol format into the object-oriented interface description language format (col 3, lines 9-19 and col 8, lines 25-44);

a message according to the object-oriented interface description language format into the network management protocol format (fig 3, col 3, lines 9-19 and col 8, lines 25-44).

5. As per claims 11 and 17, claims 11 and 17 are rejected for similar reasons as in claim 1, above.
6. As per claim 18, Ismael discloses Receiving the value of the Management Information Base variable (col 8, lines 56-59) from the user application after it processes the request (fig 3 and 8, col 7, lines 8-16);
Sending the response message in the object-oriented interface description language (getter and setter, col 3, lines 9-24) format to the network management master-agent process (fig 3 and 8, col 3, lines 9-24).
7. As per claim 2, Ismael discloses a network management software module coupled to the network management master-agent process via the first interface (fig 3, col 2, lines 9-50).
8. As per claim 3, Network management system according to claim 2, wherein the network management software module comprises a graphical user interface for presenting network management information to a user (MIB browser, col 2, lines 54-56 and col 18, lines 56-58).
9. As per claims 4, 12, and 19, Ismael discloses wherein the network management protocol is the Simple Network Management Protocol or the

Simple Network Management Protocol Version 2 (fig 3, col 8, lines 39-44).

10. As per claims 5, 13, and 20, Ismael discloses wherein the object-oriented interface description language is the Common Object Request Broker Architecture (CORBA technology is the open standard for heterogeneous computing. CORBA complements the Java platform by providing a distributed object framework, fig 3, col 8, lines 39-67).

11. As per claim 6, Ismael discloses network management sub-agent processes (fig 3) coupled to the network management master-agent process via the second interface (fig 3, col 2, lines 6-26).

12. As per claims 7, 14, and 21, Ismael discloses one Management Information Base (col 8, lines 56-60) for each network management sub-agent process wherein each Management Information Base is coupled to the network management sub-agent process (fig 3, col 8, lines 25-59);

wherein each Management Information Base (col 8, lines 56-60) is designed for specifying the structure of management information (repository service, col 3, lines 8-24) in terms of the objects to be managed (predefined variables) of an application to be monitored (fig 6, repository service, col 3,

lines 8-24).

13. As per claims 8 and 22, Ismael discloses wherein at least one of the Management Information Bases (col 8, lines 56-60) is defined in the Abstract Syntax Notation code (managed objects, col 1, lines 36-45 and col 3, lines 9-24).

14. As per claims 9, 15, and 23, Ismael discloses wherein at least one of the network management sub-agent processes comprises a further conversion unit for converting data (repository service, col 3, lines 8-24) of a Management Information Base (col 8, lines 56-59) specified by a user in Extensible Markup Language format into the Abstract Syntax Notation format (managed objects, col 8, lines 48-59 and col 1, lines 38-45).

15. As per claims 10, 16, and 24 Ismael discloses wherein at least one of the network management agent processes is operated on a Hewlett-Packard UNIX operating system (col 8, lines 21-23).

Response to Arguments

16. Applicant's arguments filed 11/18/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive, therefore rejections to claim 1-24 is maintained.

17. In response to applicants argument "n particular, it is not disclosed that the m-beans", examiner respectfully disagrees. Ismael discloses a first computer system having a network management master-agent process unit installed therein (6, 3,fig 1); A plurality of second computer systems, wherein a network management sub-agent (20, fig 1) process is installed on each of the second computer systems (4, 5, fig 1) and wherein the second computer systems are different from the first computer system (4, 5, fig 1); the network management master-agent unit (6,3,fig 1) having a first interface being adapted to communicate (20, fig 3) with a network management software (20,fig 3) module using a network management protocol format (extensible and flexible framework, 20,fig 3, col 2, lines 9-13 and col 5, lines 25-39); a second interface being adapted to communicate (20,fig 3) with the network management (20,fig 3, col 2, lines, 14-26) sub-agent processes using an object-oriented interface description language format (col 3, lines 9-24) and being connected between the first computer system and the plurality of second computer systems (3, 4, 5, and 2, fig 1);

the network management master-agent process unit (3,6, fig 1) further comprising a converting (col 8, lines 26-33) unit for converting a message according (col 3, lines 9-19) to the network management protocol format into the object-oriented interface description language format (col 3, lines 9-19 and col 8, lines 25-44); a message according to the object-oriented interface description language format into the network management protocol format (fig 3, col 3, lines 9-19 and col 8, lines 25-44).

18. Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

19. Applicant's arguments do not comply with 37 CFR 1.111(c) because they do not clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. Further, they do not show how the amendments avoid such references or objections.

Conclusion

20. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad A Siddiqi whose telephone number is (571) 272-3976. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MAS


JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100